DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 156 061 HE 010 196

AUTHOR Mondale, Clarence C., Ed.
TITLE Relevance Revisited: Curriculum Development in the Humanities. No. II: Administrative Strategies for Curriculum Change.
INSTITUTION George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. Div. of Experimental Programs.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 49p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Policy; Change Strategies; Conference Reports; Doctoral Degrees; *Experimental Programs; Faculty Organizations; Honors Curriculum; *Humanities; Interdisciplinary Approach; Legal Education; Masters Degrees; Philosophy; *Relevance (Education); Sociology; Student Organizations
IDENTIFIERS *George Washington University DC

ABSTRACT

Papers presented in advance of a workshop on "administrative strategies" for curricular change in the humanities and brief summaries of discussions taking place at the workshop are provided. Background papers include: "Curricular Change and the Humanities," by Edward A. Lindell; "Developing Administrative Strategies for Curricular Change," by Edward J. Kormondy; and "The South End of the Magnet," by Herbert C. McArthur. Papers relating George Washington University experiences include: "The Division of Experimental Programs," by Clarence C. Mondale; "Budgeting for Academic Change," by Henry Solomon; "The Rise and Fall of a Sophomore Honors Program and the Emergence of the 700 Series," by Harry Veide, Jr.; "The Sociology Department and the Division of Experimental Programs," by Ruth Wallace; "Interdisciplinary Programs at George Washington University: The Experience with Legal Studies," by Ralph C. Nash, Jr.; "Philosophers and Social Policy: The M.A. Program in Philosophy and Social Policy," by T.Z. Lavine; "The Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Program in Education Policy," by Carl J. Lange; "The Role of Student Organizations," by Roderick S. French; and "Evaluating the Experimental Courses: The GW Experience," by Marshall W. Davis. (SPG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED156061

Administrative Strategies for Curriculum Change

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Roderick Frank

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Relevance Revisited: Curriculum Development in the Humanities

No. II

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CLARENCE C. MONDALE
EDITOR

George Washington University
Division of Experimental Programs
Washington, D.C.

HE010196

RELEVANCE REVISITED: CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN THE HUMANITIES

A SERIES OF REPORTS ON FOUR WORKSHOPS

CLARENCE C. MONDALE
GENERAL EDITOR

RELEVANCE REVISITED: CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN THE HUMANITIES is a series of reports on four workshops held by the Division of Experimental Programs, George Washington University and supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities.

There are four numbers in the series:

No. I Service, Learning and Individual Development

No. II Administrative Strategies for Curriculum Change

No. III Humanists and Policy Studies

No. IV Local Studies and Experiential Education

Copies of each number are available free of charge from the Division of Experimental Programs, George Washington University, Washington, D. C. 20052. The supply is limited.

ADMINISTRATIVE STRATEGIES FOR CURRICULUM CHANGE

CLARENCE C. MONDALE, EDITOR

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY 1977

INTRODUCTION

Academic humanists, with considerable encouragement from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), are beginning to entertain two unfamiliar ideas. The first is that they share interests among themselves that transcend departmental loyalties. The second is that their professional interests include concern for the directions of curriculum change and development in their home institutions--in the humanities and as the humanities relate to general education and to institutional mission. It is one thing to entertain the unfamiliar ideas. It is another to know what to do with them. We hope that this series of four reports, having to do with the practical implications of those ideas at conventional institutions of higher learning, may contribute to more informed discussion among colleagues sharing our concerns.

Over an eight-year period, the George Washington University, with the support of NEH, has been involved in a major program in institutional development in the humanities. The GW program emphasized "alternative" approaches to liberal education: field-study; work-study; issue-oriented courses; policy studies. The program attempted to make our curriculum more directly responsive to student interests and community needs. Over the years, a host of experimental courses and programs were launched, with interestingly mixed results. As of June 1977, NEH support for the GW program terminates. A small follow-up grant from NEH has made it possible for us to offer a series of four workshops on topics of particular concern to our program, as a means of reflecting upon our experiences in company with interested colleagues throughout this region of the country. That same grant provided for this series of reports.

The four workshops featured presentations by guests of national reputation and participation by educators from throughout this region and from GW. The first workshop addressed issues related to making work-placement part of liberal education. The second discussed a range of administrative strategies for effecting curricular change. The third reviewed attempts at GW and elsewhere to involve humanists in the study of public policy. The final workshop assessed the growing interest in making local materials the subject of study in the humanities.

The structure of these four reports reflects the structure of the workshops themselves. They were held at the Airlie Conference Center, Warrenton, Virginia. They lasted one day, beginning on Friday afternoon and concluding at noon on Saturday. They included plenary sessions devoted to presentations by our guest speakers, review of the GW activities in reference to short working papers developed by GW participants, and small-group discussion of general issues of interest to participants. Each of these reports includes papers by the guest speakers, the GW working papers and a summary of issues raised in the small-group discussions.

C.M.

PREFACE

This document includes papers presented in advance of a workshop on "administrative strategies" for curricular change in the humanities. It also includes brief summaries of discussions taking place at the workshop. There were some complaints on the part of participants that the questions addressed by the workshop were too large in scope to be profitably addressed at a one-day workshop. A few participants complained that the workshop had no clear focus ("change for what?" they would ask). In editing the papers and reviewing the recordings of discussions at the workshop, it seemed to me that the workshop did address profitably but in a general way some very specific and interrelated questions.

The focus of discussion was upon means rather than ends. The discussants were administrators, by and large, rather than philosophers. They were also, by and large, trained as humanists. They shared the feeling that the academic humanities were in trouble. They were variously involved in attempts to revitalize the humanities at conventionally (i.e. departmentally) structured colleges and universities. They thought in terms of marginal and incremental changes. They wanted to improve communications among disciplines in the humanities. They wanted to get the humanities involved in ameliorating the current single-minded interest on the part of students in vocational training. They were interested in addressing again the question of general or liberal education, and the part humanists were to play in giving such education plausibility and coherence.

Discussion represented a considerable range of perspectives. Some participants were relatively satisfied with the present structure of the university but felt the need for a radical redefinition, a philosophical recasting, of what is meant by "the humanities" and by "liberal education." Edward Lindell, inspired by Robert Hutchins, attempted to find room within departmentally structured institutions for intensive sophomore-level programs intended to acquaint students with past and present human greatness. Edward Kormondy helps direct an "alternative" institution, the logic of which seems to derive at one remove or another from the thought of John Dewey. Most participants came from institutions, like GW and like the SUNY central administration, as described by Herbert McArthur, that "muddle along." They were committed to the "multiversities" they served; they were influential in the politics of those institutions and very aware of what could not be done; within such constraints, and more or less eclectically, they looked to any and all feasible strategies for self-renewal within the humanities at their particular institutions.

CONTENTS

Introduction iii

Preface v

I. Background Papers 1

Curricular Change and the Humanities
Edward A. Lindell 2

Developing Administrative Strategies for Curricular Change
Edward J. Kormondy 7

The South End of the Magnet
Herbert C. McArthur 12

II. The GW Experience 17

The Division of Experimental Programs
Clarence C. Mondale 18

Budgeting for Academic Change
Henry Solomon 22

The Rise and "Fall" of a Sophomore Honors Program and the Emergence of the 700 Series
Harry Yeide, Jr. 24

The Sociology Department and the Division of Experimental Programs
Ruth Wallace 26

Interdisciplinary Programs at George Washington University: The Experience With Legal Studies
Ralph C. Nash, Jr. 27

Philosophers and Social Policy: The M.A. Program in Philosophy and Social Policy
T. Z. Lavine 29

The Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Program in Education Policy
Carl J. Lange 31

The Role of Faculty-Student Organizations
Roderick S. French 33

Evaluating the Experimental Courses: The GW Experience
Marshall W. Davies 34

III. Summary of Small-Group Discussions 38

Workshop Participants 41

I. BACKGROUND PAPERS

The three "guest experts" were asked to submit brief background papers on the topic of the workshop. These papers were distributed to participants in advance of the workshop. The papers are here reproduced in edited form. Following each paper is a summary of what the author and workshop participants had to say about that paper.

CURRICULAR CHANGE AND THE HUMANITIES

Edward A. Lindell*

My remarks today are centered primarily upon experiences at the University of Denver and Gustavus Adolphus College. Both institutions have received substantial grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). In both instances significant curriculum reform was involved. Certain generalizations seem to surface as I reflect upon those experiences.

1. People must be aware that curricular change is at best an act which enables; that is to say, the best curriculum in the world is going to fail if those engaged in instruction are not of high quality, and the worst curriculum imagined will likely succeed if those doing the instructing are highly competent.

2. The curricular change must be correlated with institutional mission.

3. The practitioners, i.e., the faculty, must be convinced that their task will be made more effective, more interesting and more valuable as a result of the contemplated change.

4. There should be some vehicle which allows experimental forms to be tested without commitment to wholesale change.

Let me cite an illustration.

In the 60's many of us became convinced that faculty in both the social sciences and the sciences at our university had been much more innovative and willing to experiment relative to teaching techniques and relative to curricular change than had our colleagues in the humanities. Part of this had been due to the fact that because of external funding more money had been available to create many more positions in the social sciences and in the sciences than was the case in the humanities; and, secondly, more instructional aids, it seemed, had been developed in the social sciences and sciences than in the humanities. In any event, whenever the social sciences and the sciences thought a change might be necessary they were apt to caucus one with another and oftentimes the various departments in the sciences and social sciences met informally as divisions, which was highly unusual to say the least. The humanities, on the other hand, displayed more interest in autonomy than in any divisional activity. In an effort to change the state of affairs, I invited a representative from each of the departments in the humanities (and, as it turned out, in the fine arts) to a series of breakfast meetings to be held on a weekly basis to discuss the state of affairs in the humanities and in a programmatic sense to attempt to determine what the role of the

* President, Gustavus Adolphus College

humanities was or should be in a liberal arts college. This conversation at breakfast continued weekly for a period of almost seven months. Somewhere after the second or third month it was learned that development grants of significant size were being offered by NEH and we began very gradually to incorporate the possibility of a major grant from NEH as a part of the discussion. The key to whatever success we enjoyed, I believe, came largely from the fact that the conversation dealt with the nature and extent of our contribution in the humanities to a total liberal arts education. Once the discussion, which attempted to assess that contribution, began to become precise, it was very easy to move into the need for interdisciplinary and interdepartmental cooperation. It became very easy to evaluate prototypes and models. It became very easy to ultimately write a proposal, but this was largely because we started to talk about the humanities from an ideological, idealistic and sometimes romantic point of view,and there we found some common ground and on occasion consensus. Obviously, not everyone was in agreement ideologically or curricularly, but we clearly developed "a sense of the meeting."

As Dean I was the convener and at all points an equal partner in the discussion. We were ultimately funded by NEH, but the great advantage was not so much the grant but rather the fact that a series of departments for the first time in the thinking of any of us found themselves engaged in a common cause, and for the first time found it possible to be engaged in intensive discussion and debate that was organized and which had consequences.

A second step then developed as a curricular strategy. We devised a plan whereby faculty members from the five major humanistic disciplines would not only lecture in the same classroom before the same class but would equally attend each others' lectures before that particular class, and this resulted in the great contribution that curricular change in the humanities made to the University of Denver. Under the new circumstances, almost none of the old strategies, preparations and teaching techniques worked anymore. Everybody had to start all over again. They had to be better prepared, because there was a critical audience not only of students but of four other colleagues at every point every day. This was fundamental and sometimes cataclysmic, but my point is this, that curricular change originated not with the administration but with the faculty. The most the administration did was to create an atmosphere for change and the change that developed, developed because there was reason to change and there was encouragement for change. I believe everyone benefited.

The new model(we spoke of "topic courses") spread to both the social sciences and the sciences. Topic courses in the humanities included "Weimar Germany 1750-1850," "Elizabethan England," and "Sung China." In the sciences we had topic courses in "Water" and in "The Age of Newton," and in the social sciences a topic course in "Human Ecology."

The consequences of this curricular change were many:

1. The humanities received a transfusion of new vision, new energy and new satisfaction and this ultimately affected both the sciences and the social sciences.

2. Teaching techniques received new attention and new visibility. Good teaching became important to many for whom it had not been especially important.

3. The relation of teaching to research and vice versa became clarified and also took on new importance.

4. Students sometimes for the first time saw faculty colleagues engaged in intellectual dispute and consequently a new model became available to them.

5. Faculty members had the satisfaction of knowing that they had worked with the administration to accomplish a common task that would likely have been ill fated if it had been imposed by either one upon the other.

In summary, the important lesson seems to be, given the growing scarcity of financial resources in higher education, that if we are to survive it must be because we have learned not just to live with one another but to encourage and assist one another.

* * * * * * *

Mr. Lindell, in the plenary session devoted to his paper, described his experiences at the University of Denver and, more recently, at Gustavus Adolphus College, to illustrate what could be done at conventional institutions to renew instruction in the humanities.

At Denver, he said, we had an institution that was not first-rate. That meant that it was possible for a dean to talk of radical change. We had to do something; we were not getting better fast enough. The sciences, because of support from the National Science Foundation, were in relatively good shape. The social sciences benefited from NSF funding and from access to a large contract research agency, and so they were in decent shape. The humanities, however, needed a radical overhaul. So as dean, he said, I convened chairpeople from the humanities as an informal group meeting at breakfasts over a period of time to discuss what could and should be done. At that time I was not aware, Lindell said, that NEH development grants existed. Arnold Toynbee had been on campus as a visiting professor before these discussions commenced. Toynbee had argued that if you knew something in detail about a given society during a given period, lessons could be learned that applied to other societies at other times. He listed some hallmark questions. For example, how did the society treat its creative people? What balance was there in the society between freedom and authority? And so on. At our breakfasts, he continued, we agreed that one problem in lower-level humanities courses was that they emphasized generalization at the expense of intensity. We decided that we would make it possible for sophomores to undertake intensive study of a given society for an entire academic quarter. We decided that one type of society would be the city state, e.g., fifth-century Athens; Florence at the time of the Renaissance. Another was to be a civilization in which mass

movements had taken place, e.g., Sung China; Imperial Russia. Finally, we were to study emerging civilizations, e.g., twentieth-century Mexico. We also decided that each quarter-course would involve representatives from five departments in the humanities; that each would involve a philosopher, an historian, a teacher of literature, perhaps someone in languages, as well as faculty from art history or music history or whatever. These decisions made, we invited proposals for particular programs. Finally, we submitted a proposal to NEH, with particular programs described in detail, and we were funded.

The programs lasted throughout the day, Lindell said. There was usually a morning lecture followed by discussion. Faculty and students lunched together. Individual faculty members met with subgroups of students in the afternoons. Lectures were videotaped, so that they could be listened to again in the evenings. Sometimes, he said, we employed conference calls on particular topics. For example, we had a telephone conversation with Werner Heisenberg. With help from NEH, we brought the Royal Shakespeare Company to Denver, in conjunction with a course on Elizabethan England. We used the interterm period for travel abroad to complement subjects of study. (It didn't seem to matter whether such travel came before or after the course.) We hoped to achieve a total learning environment for those lower-level undergraduates. We wanted the students to come in touch with greatness--better several feet from greatness than a few inches from mediocrity.

There were many problems, Lindell said. The new programs represented alternatives to departmental degree requirements. The department of philosophy, for example, faced the prospect of losing majors because there were to be only half as many introductory sections of philosophy. As dean, he continued, I took a "calculated risk." I signed a statement guaranteeing that if there was a decrease in philosophy majors as a result of the new programs, I would find the funds necessary to replace the lost sections of the introductory courses. I did that in one form or another for all affected departments. As it turned out, majors in the humanities have increased as a result of the new program, in spite of decreasing enrollments overall, and I have had the satisfaction of tearing up those statements. Individual faculty members felt threatened by the exposure the new program gave them to their colleagues. It was important to choose individuals for the programs that were compatible, and that was a very sensitive matter. Substantial additions to our library collections had to be made to accommodate the new interdisciplinary emphasis. If students were taking a sequence course, they were in trouble. Premedical students and students in the sciences were often unable to enroll in the quarter-courses. Students in the languages and in accounting experienced the same problem.

The benefits have been enormous, Lindell said. Students describe the program as a fundamental learning experience. Faculty members become much more flexible and open and alive. Both faculty and students value the intensity of the experience.

At Gustavus, Mr. Lindell continued, we have made refinements and adaptations of the Denver plan, again with help from NEH. At Gustavus we do not have a large enough student population to support quarter-courses. We have instead decided to develop blocks of three courses in

the humanities having to do with aspects of the same subject. Right now we are offering a block in Scandinavian studies. If we were offering a block in classical Athens we might combine a classical history course with a classical literature course with a classical philosophy course. The courses are offered in sequence during the day. The three professors are given released time to plan the courses so that they are complementary, and they all attend all courses in the block. Courses are coordinated so that all three courses are studying similar topics at the same time. (So that, for the course on Athens, all students would be studying Plato at the same time.) The arrangement at Gustavus allows students in sequence courses to continue the sequence and enroll in the block of courses in the humanities. The Gustavus experiment is just underway, and so it is difficult to conclude much, but it seems to be working well.

Mr. Lindell concluded with several summary comments. At both Denver and Gustavus Adolphus, the administrator played a catalytic, nondirective role. The fundamental responsibility was with the faculty. Compromises had to be made to secure the full cooperation of the departments. The whole process began with the realization that the humanities were in bad shape. Outside funding, he argued, is necessary if there is to be any momentum to significant change. As others at this workshop have been saying, he went on, you can make too much of strategies and of curriculum. The important thing is the quality of the people involved. Finally, nationwide, there is a need for leaders to give visibility to the cause of the humanities. Listening to and understanding Bach is as exciting and important as any space shot, but we humanists and administrators have not been able to communicate that fact to students and to the larger public.

DEVELOPING ADMINISTRATIVE STRATEGIES FOR CURRICULAR CHANGE

Edward J. Kormondy*

Whereas change itself as well as the direction and rate of change of most things is inherent in nature's laws and is thus in large measure unaffected by human forces, the direction and rate of change of culture is largely under human control. The particular aspect of culture addressed in this workshop, the direction and rate of change of academic curriculum, is, perhaps exclusively, under human control.

In culture as in nature, there is a dynamic interaction that obtains between form and function, structure and action. As an ecologist who considers himself more broadly or generically a biologist, I have had the advantage of assessing this interplay of structure and function at all levels of organization. Evolutionarily regarded, structure exists because of function, and function obtains because of structure; structure is and has been influenced by function, function is and has been influenced by structure.

Extend the concept: academic structure and function are dynamically interrelated to permit or prevent, to allow or to preclude, to accelerate or decelerate. As obvious as this condition may be, it is not always acknowledged as a necessary operating condition, or if it is, it is done with old structures vainly trying to serve new functions, new wine in old bottles. The taint affects the savor! By the same token, I strongly support one of the most significant of the roles performed by academe, the preserving of a heritage. Nor would I contend that all academic manufacturing needs an overhaul: we have evolved some superlative structures and do perform some outstanding functions. Some of these have stood the test of time; some of these will continue to serve society well into the future. In academe, changes, and the direction and rate of such changes, will be largely imperceptible, but change they will.

A change in function does not necessarily require a completely new structure. After all, there aren't that many new configurations possible anyway, a limitation which is imposed by the very structure of structures. It is rather a case that different structures than those currently in use may be needed. What is called for as a response is the creative act, which, in art as in science, is the bringing together of elements not previously associated or associated in different ways. Thus, canvas and paint--two elements have been creatively exercised by a Rembrandt and a Picasso to produce quite different functions; similarly with natural events in the mind of a Lamarck and a Darwin. Academicians do not have unlimited elements to associate, nor are there unlimited configurations in which they can be arrayed. The same elements in different configurations, however, can eclipse one another, or shine radiantly.

The structural elements of academic nature which are to be reckoned with include students (remember that's the raison d'etre of academe!),

* Vice President and Provost, The Evergreen State College.

faculty, administrators, trustees, benefactors (public and private), support staff, buildings, equipment, libraries, and money. Depending on your predilections, you can bring these elements into fewer aggregates or split them into myriad parts. And, there may well be need to recognize additional elements in some systems, but these several identified components should suffice for the general purpose at hand. These structures are in turn structured in various ways to perform a variety of functions (e.g., faculty senates, academic departments, staff unions) and it is not invariably the case that the original function for which a given structure now exists is long since lost in history, that it has been replaced by other functions; or, also, it may be that it may not have any valid academic function any longer. I would argue that all too many academic structures have long since lost sight of one of the prime, if not the prime, functions of the university--teaching. As examples of lost functions, behold the endless debates of faculty senates on trivial matters and the time-consuming involvement of faculty in governing an institution rather than teaching in it with the same vigor, ego-involvement and so on they give to such governing activity.

I've been asked to identify some "how to" ideas that we might profitably explore in this workshop relative to strategies for effecting structure/function relationships to achieve particular ends.

At the first, I consider that the end is the beginning, omega is the alpha. There must be a clear conception of the goal(s) and objective(s), even if the goal itself is one of open-endedness (for that, too, is a goal). One should design a structure and thereby configure the elements to achieve an end; the elements become the means to do. But as noted above, means, or structural configurations, too often become ends in themselves. Purpose must precede program; program must be predicated on purpose. By this, I'm not intending an educationese-type, quantifiable or behavioral statement--I often find such too circumscribing if not even circumcising. I intend a more philosophical, maybe even a pragmatic, and most surely an idealistic statement. Einstein did not set out to write a theory of relativity; he never would have gotten an NSF grant for his research intent; yet that's precisely the kind of "statement" I can tolerate for the purpose I have in mind.

Acknowledging the structural components (and simultaneously recognizing the fantastic diversity, as well as basic similarity, that obtains within any given institution and certainly between or among institutions), and accepting the initial need to articulate a purpose or function to be served, what are the strategies that can be employed? At the risk of seeming flip, but recognizing the value (as well as limitation) of the catch word, I'll suggest a few strategies in somewhat commonplace terms, briefly identify their translation in academic language, and leave a more in-depth discussion for our work sessions. My list is certainly not exhaustive, nor is it intended to be restrictive--hopefully it will be heuristic.

The Messiah Approach. This involves someone who has a message (purpose), and a methodology, who is persistent and persuasive, who develops a following and by usually non-violent means brings about change in spite of existing structure. Perhaps the free university movement is a case in point.

The Guru Approach. The individual held in highest esteem is persuaded, if he or she needs to be, to undertake some particular mission of academic change. A few words uttered by the guru advances the change with considerable alacrity. Perhaps Chicago's Hutchins is a case in point.

The Liberation Approach. Put the most aggressive and assertive liberationists (of the academic variety, that is) in charge of some proposed change. They will gavel and/or shovel the way to change. Perhaps the advent of black studies, women's studies, gay studies are cases in point.

The Handyman's (oops Handyperson's) Approach. Take element (e.g., faculty) in right hand and turn counterclockwise gently if north of equator, clockwise if south of equator. My referent here is the Coriolis force by which faculty, in this case, need to be turned 180 degrees from their current path. Perhaps Colorado College's curricular scheduling change is a case in point.

The Industrial Approach. Make large capital investment in promising venture as inducement and enticement to get elements into new configurations. The Mellon and NEH grants to George Washington University may be cases in point.

The Julia Child Approach. Gather all ingredients beforehand, break, pare and peel those requiring same, boil or steam as needed, mix in blender at speed appropriate to attain desired mush. The faculty senate approach perhaps?

The Ralph Nader Approach. Caveat emptor underlies this approach, and thus there are two outcomes: 1) for the faculty, change nothing lest the consumer taste honey and want more; and 2) for the students, change nothing lest a friend's last year's term paper would not be useable this year. More seriously, the Nader approach is consumer-oriented and the strategy becomes one of assessing consumer need, letting it stand as the carrot to maintaining enrollments and hence, faculty jobs.

The Dean's Approach (sometimes called mycologist's approach). This method is also used by Provost with Deans, Deans with department chairmen, department chairmen with faculty, and certainly by faculty with students. Treat the elements like mushrooms, keep them in the dark at all times, and occasionally feed them some manure. There are too many instances of this approach to single out any given one as a case in point.

Other Approaches. It takes but little more thought to develop a yet more extensive and comprehensive list. Among the entries: The Political Spoils Approach, The Cover-Up Approach, The Blackmail Approach (if no change, no promotion or tenure), The Ad Nauseam Approach (you do it just to shut the guy up), and so on ad nauseam.

Epilogue

Provosts are supposed to be but one step removed in dignity and aplomb from the Presidents under and for whom they dutifully serve (even

if they've used most of these strategies and others not printable in such circles as these). My apologies therefore to all other provosts offended by the lightness of my remarks. But that brings me to what I regard as the most critical element in this entire set of givens, assumptions, propositions, and proposals--the presence of key, sympathetic and actively supporting individuals who create the ambience crucial to effecting change. Again, this seems so obvious a precondition that it shouldn't warrant comment. Nonetheless, my experience says it needs to be stressed. Over my years of site-visiting departments and colleges I've seen the range: creative, dynamic faculty with you know what and vinegar in their vessels blockaded by governance structures or dead (but not yet buried) administrators. Conversely I've seen administrators drowning themselves in the well of frustration with recalcitrant faculty. And, finally, I've seen faculty trying to move differently, let alone ahead, with students who know and want only yesterday. On this particular point and in a very thoughtful and helpful study, Lewis Mayhew, of Stanford University, has noted that the optimum conditions for innovation include a stimulus from external conditions, "presided over by a chief executive who is interested in change and willing to use the full resources of his position to stimulate it."* Administrators have the keys to unlock creativity, or padlocks to frustrate same.

* * * * * * *

Mr. Kormondy, during the plenary session devoted to his paper, discussed arrangements at Evergreen State College, as an instance of a non-traditional kind of institution, with its own set of "administrative strategies."

Evergreen State College, now in its sixth year of operation, was created by the state of Washington in the expectation that it would not be a traditional institution. In the early stages of planning for the college, it was decided that its education was to be holistic in nature; that it would emphasize interconnections between theory and practice; and that it would lay great stress upon the responsibility of the student for his own education. The result is an institution without departments; involving faculty without tenure or rank; with a curriculum that is continuously remade; with a strong commitment to interdisciplinary study. The college also has a commitment to small-group study. The ratio of faculty to students is one to twenty. At Evergreen the ratio describes the fact: classes are not allowed to exceed twenty students in size; one faculty member has responsibility for twenty students for an entire quarter or year. Finally, no alpha-numeric grades are given. Rather credit is assigned and students are given written evaluations by faculty members for their performance in a program. Those evaluations often run thirty or forty pages in length.

*Lewis B. Mayhew. 1976. How Colleges Change: Approaches to Academic Reform. Published by ERIC Clearinghouse on Information Resources, Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching.

The student enrolls for a single program in a given quarter. Work will involve some mix among book seminars, project seminars, and field work. Students are in class some twelve to fifteen hours per week. Much of the teaching is done one on one. A very substantial number of students earn credit through work-placement. Academic programs are designed anew each academic year. Writing and reading are understood to be the responsibility of the whole faculty.

Several special problems deserve comment. The college now has what it calls "major areas" for student concentration. These are not the equivalent of traditional academic majors, but they do help identify to the outside world what the student had at Evergreen. Language training combines intensive study, study abroad and self-paced learning. Students take intensive training in a given language prior to a group visit to a country in which that language is spoken. This has so far involved trips to Japan, China, Russia, France and Mexico. Such study is reinforced with self-paced learning in a language laboratory. With the help of a grant from the National Science Foundation, the college has developed self-paced learning in mathematics (through calculus) and in some of the sciences. Students going on to graduate school do not always get training in all aspects of a given discipline. With help from Empire State College, faculty at Evergreen have developed self-paced learning modules to prepare students for Graduate Record Examinations (in psychology, for example).

Faculty and student "burn-out" has been a real problem. In the second and third years of the college it was an open question as to whether the Evergreen system would work over the long run. Now it seems clear that the system, although involving great expenditures of energy, can also work year after year. Kormondy said that it was his conviction that students at his college did derive benefits not available at conventional institutions.

Kormondy was asked to comment on how much of the Evergreen scheme could be adapted by traditional institutions. He said that traditional institutions often offered one or another kind of course or program offered at Evergreen. The Stony Brook program described by Mr. McArthur, for example, had much in common with Evergreen activities, including the very valuable faculty seminar. The combination of activities that makes up the Evergreen program is probably not possible at traditional institutions. The combination reinforces a primary loyalty to the difficult task of interdisciplinary learning on the part of faculty and students. In the traditional institution, the primary loyalty, of course, is to the department.

THE SOUTH END OF THE MAGNET

Herbert C. McArthur*

Although I keep telling myself that the central administration of a large multi-campus system must have much greater relative freedom to promote curriculum change, it doesn't feel that way.

Curriculum change happens in the faculty, and I feel farther from the faculty than I would feel in the administration of a single campus.

And authority doesn't flow down through an administrative hierarchy to the campuses, in academic matters. Rather the central administration is part of a field of force which radiates out and around and back. If there is central leadership in curriculum change, it is mostly a matter of personal leadership by the Chancellor (the north pole of the magnet) through his influence on the Presidents and the Trustees, and his influence on the faculty at large through public statements--with a loop back to him from these constituencies.

The south end of the magnet (the central administration) rarely contributes to the amount of force for change that is radiating in the field. Rather its contribution is to remove obstructions and to provide channels through which the field can effectively do its work.

Not long ago, when money and politics were both smiling at us, we could create entirely new institutions, designed for new kinds of curricula. Thus in New York State we created a non-residential college, which has come a long way though it is still struggling to stand fully and firmly on its feet--Empire State College. We created a College at Purchase, the mating of an experimental college of liberal arts and a professional school of the performing arts. We created a College at Utica-Rome, an upper-division college for technical and vocational two-year college transfer students. Nowadays all of these neonates are suffering from malnutrition, and our last attempt at new progeny--a college-within-walls for prisoners--never saw the light of day.

Once State University made a tremendous investment in equipment and in central staff in support of curriculum development with reliance on television and the like. We even had a University of the Air, which ran for eleven semesters. For several reasons these activities have disappeared or been reduced or held at a low level. Funding dried up. Leadership changed. Faculty resisted.

I've just made a list of the things we currently do in central administration that could be considered as contributing to or supporting curricular change on the campus. Not surprisingly, most of them depend on the Chancellor's prestige to a great extent and on the availability to him of overhead monies generated out of grants in our Research

* Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs, State University of New York.

Foundation. He has what is called a Chancellor's Innovative Fund; as you can imagine, it is the target of much striving and competition. Occasionally ad hoc support can be had from the Fund for a campus project--not a lot of money but enough to get things started and to serve as pump-priming.

But another use of the Chancellor's Fund has been the support of formal and on-going programs, some of which have a relevance to our theme. First are two programs that are more important to scholarship than to teaching, I think, but which do provide some cross-fertilization and stimulation amongst the faculties: a Faculty Exchange program (guest scholars for short visits) and a series of mini-conferences called Conversations in the Disciplines, involving outsiders as well as SUNY people. Second are two programs which speak directly to good teaching, Distinguished Teaching Professorships and Chancellor's Awards for Excellence in Teaching. These programs benefit the curriculum to the extent that they provide visible and tangible rewards for good teaching--to the extent that good teaching has any relationship to curriculum improvement, which is not demonstrably always the case. Third, a program of Faculty Grants for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction is obviously right to our purpose. Unfortunately that has been just a one-level program. By that I mean that it has made a lot of small grants for small undertakings, but it has never picked up promising projects for longer-range development, or broadening, or broadcasting.

These programs are currently being reviewed to see whether they could be overhauled for better effect, perhaps by combining them with a larger effort aimed at faculty development (the current buzz-phrase for the problem, what to do with faculties that are locked in by tenure and declining enrollments).

There are a few other things we can do centrally. We can provide assistance for grant-seekers, through the Research Foundation and also through our office in Washington. We can generate a bit of publicity occasionally, although research results are generally deemed more newsworthy. And we can of course shuffle the paperwork of curriculum approval and the like, as brokers in the colossal educational hierarchy of New York State that culminates in the State Education Department and the Board of Regents. Let's not go into that.

Most of what we can do does come down to two things: the Chancellor's ideas and prestige, and money. If we could establish and maintain, in these days of tightening budgets, the practice of setting aside a specified percentage of every campus budget for curricular research and development, the money would probably be well spent for the most part. It is difficult to imagine that we'll be able to do it. The prevailing view in the legislature and budget office is that faculty members ought to be doing curriculum development as part of whatever it is (sic) they ordinarily are doing; since it's obvious they don't work very hard, and we in central administration can't pin down in business-like fashion a specific definition of faculty workload, and besides the faculty is very well paid, indeed. A clear sign of the hard times we face is that even those overhead monies I mentioned earlier are now being eyed by the Governor's staff.

There are two projects I thought it might be worthwhile to look at close-up, as case histories. One involves religious studies, the other general education.

Religious studies is a favorite cause of the Chairman of our Board of Trustees. It is also supported by the Chancellor and by some of the campus Presidents. Thus it is a case-study of curriculum change primarily from the top down. How was it handled? First, the Chancellor used the Innovative Fund to appoint a distinguished consultant, who provided a sizeable report. The next step was a planning committee, made up of some University faculty and some distinguished outsiders. The planning committee's report, perhaps surprisingly, shifted the relative emphasis from graduate education and research to undergraduate education, while continuing the consultant's general proposed format of a combination of University-wide activities (a Center) and individual campus initiatives. State budget support of this project has not been forthcoming, and it has basically been kept alive by the Innovative Fund, sufficiently to mount some campus colloquia. Meanwhile, with the assistance of the Chairman of the Board, a reasonable grant from a private foundation has come through, and religious studies will doubtless find a toehold in some campus budgets in the next year or so, particularly at Stony Brook where the President is powerfully committed to the idea.

The second case-study involves a broader--and vaguer--topic, general education. Here we have coming together a combination of interest by the Chancellor and ferment on the campus. As the newspapers have told us, the pendulum of curriculum change seems to have swung back now from its last swing in the direction of wide-openness of the curriculum. Voices are heard in the land crying the old slogans once more: a core of knowledge and skills that everyone needs, the ability to write and communicate well, a common intellectual and cultural heritage, and so forth. Some of these voices are motivated by conservatism, some by a continuing liberalism, some no doubt by new forms of radicalism. Thus the campuses are not moving in the same direction nor at the same speed, and some are not moving at all.

Meanwhile the Chancellor is interested and makes general education the theme of some public remarks. A commitment to general education appears in the University's master plan. An invitational conference is held on the subject, using a small private foundation grant. Now we are trying to follow the directions of general education on the campuses and at the same time attempting to define a centralized project that would be both useful to the campuses and sexy enough to attract further private or federal grants.

The difficulty I am having in trying to dream up such a project is that, unlike religious studies, general education is an empty structure, lacking substantive content. On a campus you can get substantive content into it, because the faculty can agree upon some particular themes or emphases. I can't think of a way to do that in the central staff without ending up with so broad a theme as to be impossibly vague, because of the effort we must make not to appear to impose intellectual restrictions on our widely diverse faculty or to preempt their initiatives in curriculum design.

Well, of course the answer is, appoint a committee! And that's what we're doing, a University-wide committee of faculty and administrators, in the hope of some lucky brainstorming.

Over all these activities, however they manage to get carried on, there looms the huge and aged question, how do we know whether they're worth doing, or if done how do we know they were done well? The question is huge because of course it applies to everything we're doing, not just to the part that we're tinkering with. It's my opinion, after long struggles to work it out, that we are indeed stuck with the permanent unsolvability of this question. We're going to have to continue to use all of the partial answers we can find, of which the best is probably the considered judgment of the wisest judge (and how do you identify that person?). But we will not find that ultimate justification of the humanities or of any other educational content or goal, sufficiently comprehensive and comprehensible to satisfy ourselves, or legislators. The reason why we will have to be as happy as we can with approximate evaluation is that education is part of a whole, and the whole is too large for us to see. That is (if I may incur some possible wrath by sounding like a sociobiologist), education is an evolutionary strategy of the human race, working not with individuals but with the species. Or better, working with pseudo-species, as Erikson calls them, those subspecific groups we identify with (family, race, nationality, and the like)--but, if we are lucky, leading us into broader and broader groupings so that some day we may truly recognize ourselves as a single species and behave more like one. Thus education is bound into the ultimate teleological mystery.

I come down finally, and perhaps pathetically, to a humble picture of the role of administrators, whether we be on a campus or in a large system. Perhaps really it would be best for us to use great restraint in trying to initiate curricular change. We might better help the cause by trying to do well those management tasks which sound so far away from the substantive joys of the curriculum but which are increasingly vital to its survival. I mean in plain language the defense of our dollars. We think now in SUNY that to provide this defense we need to do two things much better. First, we need to understand much better what it is we are now doing, what kinds of institutions we really have and whom they are serving. The institutional data we have must be analyzed and presented in more sophisticated and useful ways. Second, we need a way to define and express our priorities, in such a way as to preserve our strengths and our diversity. We think we will have to have much more explicit and workable mission statements for our campuses, types of campuses, and the University as a whole. Getting these statements will not be easy, but we have begun to try.

* * * * * * *

In discussion of the paper, Mr. McArthur and workshop participants reviewed strategies for "defending dollars" for the humanities in the face of declining enrollments. McArthur argued that humanists often live in a "ghost mansion." They imagine that their principal task is to prepare students for graduate work in their academic disciplines. For

most academic humanists, that self-image is unreal. Some eighty percent of enrollments in the humanities are in service courses for students majoring in other subjects. Teachers in the humanities must be made to see the reality. We may want to teach Browning; we may have to teach "literature and women's rights." We should do better at making a virtue out of such necessities. We should have a much more diversified notion of the mission of the humanities. Another mistake humanists make, McArthur said, is to suppose there is a dichotomy between general and career education. Of course the two are different, but they relate to one another in important ways. If career education only prepares you for immediate employment, then it is incomplete. If general education does not teach you to express yourself and to be competent at certain kinds of analysis and to keep on learning, then it is incomplete. We must do better at convincing ourselves and others that general education is important to career education.

It was remarked that upper-level courses in the humanities suffer if the involved departments do not offer major programs. McArthur said that the only viable option was to discover alternatives, like problem-oriented or theme-oriented majors. It was remarked that students come to college single-mindedly oriented toward a career, with scant interest in general education. Then, said McArthur, we have to educate those students so as to broaden their interests.

He went on to describe a program at the State University of New York at Stony Brook, directed by Professor Patrick Hill. He thought that program an interesting example of what one institution decided to do about the kinds of problems raised by the workshop. The university had just gone through a self-study, which had concluded that, because there was so much emphasis upon graduate study, undergraduate education was becoming dehumanized. A group of faculty agreed with the conclusions of the self-study and, with the help of some start-up money from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education, have come at a common problem in a new way, from the point of view of the learner. They have established what they call a Federated Learning Community. It works this way: Teachers of advanced undergraduate courses having to do with a particular theme participate in a seminar devoted to a simple, operational question, "What should students know to be properly prepared for our advanced courses?" By means of the seminar they discover corporate strengths and weaknesses, and then proceed to develop a cluster of courses having to do with the theme (in this case the theme is world hunger). The cluster of courses is taken by a single group of sophomore students, becoming in effect a semester-course. One among the faculty becomes a "master learner." He takes all the courses, meeting all course requirements. He meets regularly with the students, helping them pull the courses together. He meets regularly with his colleagues, letting them know what is or is not getting across to the students. A second thematic cluster is now under development. McArthur said that the Stony Brook course drew upon interested faculty for a short period of time, and thus did not distract them from the "main line" of professional development, as often happened with experimental programs and with core curriculums.

II. THE GW EXPFRIENCE

One objective of the workshop was to make colleagues from other institutions aware of what we had done under the grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities. As a means of self-description, we asked individuals from the university to describe and evaluate a range of courses and programs in which we had been involved. Those self-descriptions (of some two pages in length) were distributed to participants in advance of the workshop, along with the texts of the background papers. This section of the report reproduces those brief papers as they were distributed to participants.

The first paper is a general description of the evolution and nature of the Division of Experimental Programs. It is intended to supply a context for the case-studies that follow. Dean Solomon served on the DEP Steering Committee, and was principally responsible for working out the budgetary strategy he describes. Dean Yeide assesses our attempt to work out a program in cooperation with our Columbian College of Arts and Sciences. Professor Wallace describes the impact of DEP activity upon one department. Similar statements could be developed for many other departments in the humanities and in the social sciences. Professor Nash describes his considerable frustrations in attempting to establish a course and an undergraduate program in Legal Studies. In general, we found interschool cooperation, of the kind required by his program, valuable in principle and all but impossible in practice. Professor Lavine describes a new M.A. program in Philosophy and Social Policy, which seems to have gotten off to a good start. The Ph.D. in Education Policy, the subject of the statement by Vice President Lange, never had the kind of departmental home that nourishes the M.A. in philosophy. That Ph.D. program was our attempt to establish a local prototype for curriculum and research in policy studies. Professor French describes the two faculty-student organizations developed during the NEH grant period. Those organizations were complemented by the many committees advising us on course and program planning, briefly alluded to in the paper by Mr. Davies. We put a great deal of effort into formal evaluation of our courses, making some interesting mistakes along the way, and arriving at a process that has proven reasonably successful.

The several papers in combination should give the reader some sense of the range of our activities. The first session of small-group discussions was devoted to the subjects of these papers and to discussion of related activity under the grant.

THE DIVISION OF EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS*

Clarence C. Mondale**

The institutional development grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities was complemented at the George Washington University by a major five-year grant from the Richard King Mellon Charitable Trusts and by substantial grants under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Under the several grants we committed ourselves to an institution-wide curriculum development program emphasizing field-study, work-study and policy studies, as well as to two cooperative programs in black and Latin communities emphasizing clinical training in the professions and technical assistance to community agencies. These unconventional kinds of "involved" education stood in a kind of dialectical relationship to conventional faculty and departmental commitments. By the end of our first exploratory year (1969-70), we had developed a process for testing out various combinations of conventional and unconventional objectives and interests. We had yet to develop the means for directing the process. A second consideration became more important in the second and third years: if we valued our new capacity for curricular change and development, how were we to continue such activity in post-grant years? By what procedures could we set aside funds, out of the university budget, for such a purpose?

A radically informal structure characterized the GW-Washington Project (as it was called) during its first year. As the scope of Project activities increased, somewhat more formal structures were introduced. Within its first year, an assistant to the Provost began to act as liaison between the President and the Project. In Fall 1970, two committees were appointed, one to advise the President, another to advise me, to serve as periodic monitors of grant-sponsored programs.

GW delegates to a grantees meeting in Los Angeles in February 1971 began a discussion among themselves and with the President that led to the formation of an ad hoc committee, the purpose of which was to recommend to the President such administrative changes as seemed necessary for the support and furtherance of general grant objectives. By the time that ad hoc committee was convened, the university had submitted its proposal to the National Endowment for Humanities for an institutional development grant, and it seemed likely that the proposal would be funded. The NEH proposal included provision for an office to sponsor experimental courses and to administer the "humanities development" program.

---

* This statement appeared in a slightly different form in Clarence C. Mondale, A New Direction for the Urban University (George Washington University, 1974), pp. 18-21. Available from the ERIC Clearinghouse in Higher Education, The George Washington University, as Document ED132954.

** Director, Division of Experimental Programs and Professor of American Civilization.

The committee recommended that the university establish a new office. It noted three deficiencies in the institutional structure of the university, relative to grant purposes:

(1) Lack of an adequate apparatus to initiate interdisciplinary and interschool experimental programs which reflect the university's goals and priorities;

(2) Inability to incorporate successful interdisciplinary and interschool experimental programs into the long-run academic program in a systematic way; and

(3) Need for a mechanism to coordinate the teaching, research and public service activities of academic programs, so that each contributes to the effectiveness of the other.

These three deficiencies were presumed to be interrelated, and their interrelatedness argued the necessity of a new office taking as its special province the initiation of certain kinds of new courses; the incorporation of such new courses as proved successful into regular university curriculum; and a continuing attention to improving the complementarity of teaching, research and public service.

The committee judged it important that experiments sponsored by the new office not be random in nature; and that their success involve something more than their popularity among assorted faculty and students. They spoke of the need to relate experimental programs to the "goals and priorities" of institution-wide academic development. The means by which such priorities were to be established had yet to be defined. That represented a fourth deficiency of direct concern to the office they were proposing.

On July 1, 1971, the President formally accepted the recommendations of the committee by establishing what was called the Office of Program Development. The emphasis in OPD activities was upon assuring that the new office complemented, rather than competed with, existing academic units. The office was to act as catalyst among those units. Changes were to be introduced in a marginal and incremental manner, through cooperation with departments and schools throughout the university. It was supposed that the office succeeded insofar as established academic units saw its success as being in their best interests. To further that end, it was specified that OPD did not have the right to confer academic tenure or permanent faculty rank. To that same end, experimental courses were not to become part of a new degree program; and the internal logic among those courses was not to become that of a sequence or set, or of discrete curriculum.

In time, a fifth deficiency in institutional structure became evident. The university had virtually no means for long-term sponsorship of successful interdisciplinary or interdivisional courses. In January 1973, the office was authorized to act as sponsor of such courses. With this change in function, the office underwent a final change in name. It now became the Division of Experimental Programs.

The present functions of the division may be summarized as follows:

(1) To act as short-term sponsor of experimental and interdisciplinary courses;

(2) To act as long-term sponsor and administer interdisciplinary courses or other programs which are not logically congruent with the objectives of any existing academic department;

(3) To evaluate the success of curricular experiments;

(4) To find room, by addition or displacement, for desirable academic innovations in the long-term academic year program of the university;

(5) To provide incentives for academic innovation congenial to the purposes of the several related grants, among departments and schools;

(6) To relate innovation to academic planning and development of the institution as a whole.

The bulk of the new courses and programs sponsored by the division are to be short-term and experimental. In the case of any given successful experiment, the presumption is that an existing academic unit of the university will assume its long-term sponsorship. The division will assume long-term sponsorship only in those instances in which the continued success of the course or program depends upon unconventional arrangements.

In securing teachers for its new courses, the division normally buys the time of regular GW faculty from their home departments. It can occasionally hire individuals from outside the university on short-term and special bases to teach, undertake research and develop special projects. It is authorized to buy the time of individuals in and out of the university, on a short-term basis, to develop proposals appropriate to the division and to institutional objectives.

The director of the division reports directly to the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs, to insure that divisional activities are consistent with institution-wide priorities. A permanent Steering Committee, appointed and chaired by the Provost, oversees those activities.

In defining the fiscal policies of the Office of Program Development (in 1971) the planners had recognized the limitations on the means available to the university. The university depends heavily upon tuition for its operating revenues and must operate within stringent financial limits. Changes in the educational program had to be designed to take place as increments or decrements to the existing program--in the economic sense, as marginal changes. Fiscal policies designed to support the new office followed a like "marginal" strategy.

Initial funding for the office had been provided almost entirely from external sources. Three devices have been developed to assure the office returns out of university funds for services rendered. The office is credited with tuition income generated by the courses it supports. The office is credited with overhead cost recoveries incident to grants secured through its efforts. Finally, as an incentive for cooperation by departments and divisions of the university and as a source of income for the office, we have established procedures for what we call "breakage." "Breakage" works as follows: if the division buys released faculty time from a department for the teaching of one of its courses, it pays at the annual salary rate. Thus a faculty member earning $15,000 for the academic year, released for one-third of his time to teach an experimental course, would cost the division $5,000. Costs for a part-time instructor to replace that faculty member are nearly always less than those paid for full-time faculty. The difference between the full-time and part-time rates becomes the basis for breakage. Half of that difference is returned to the division, and half is credited to the department, to be used at its discretion.

Funds credited to the division are not handled as an annual budget, but are treated by fund accounting methods. A revolving fund has been established in the Provost's office, to accumulate them.

It took some time to translate the above general procedures into real figures. Based upon careful calculation for the grant period, it seems that income generated will be adequate to the present purposes of the office, even in the absence of further outside funding.

A number of interdivisional degree programs have been introduced or are under consideration by the division, to be directly funded by the university. A new Ph.D. program in Education Policy was approved by our Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. Divisional initiative was crucial to the convening of interest parties in area agencies, and of faculty and administrators throughout the university, that finally led to the proposal of that new degree. A master's degree program in Museum Education, again involving cooperation across divisions and with off-campus representatives, received necessary start-up costs, and planning support, from the division. Finally the department of philosophy has introduced, with division support, a new M.A. in Philosophy and Social Policy. This degree represents a new departure for that small department, in a direction exactly appropriate to the purposes of the NEH grant and of the division.

The establishment of the Division of Experimental Programs has been our attempt to build in the sanctions, structures and incentives needed if we are to continue the momentum generated under the grant from NEH and from the several related grants. We repeat, with some pride, that present income is adequate to present purposes, even in the absence of further outside support. The continued growth of the division will, however, depend upon locating new sources of external funding. So far as it can offer cooperating departments of the university "add-on" support to their present budgets, it offers help at minimal cost. Regardless of the funds available to it, the usefulness of the office will continue to depend upon its ability to inspire confidence among the other academic units of the university, so that its success is seen, generally, as being in their best interest.

Our commitment to a strategy of incremental change has, to date, proved successful. That cautious strategy has not allowed us to play any considerable role in the recruitment of new faculty. The "inducement" of support among present GW faculty may, on occasion, prove to be inadequate as a total strategy for effecting desirable curricular change. Present procedures defining faculty work loads frustrate rather than support team-teaching arrangements and the flexible allocations of time appropriate to clinical studies. Nonincremental change may sometimes prove necessary and feasible.

We speak of increments and incentives. We say little as to decrements and disincentives. We have at present a number of tactics rather than a strategy to effect displacement of relatively undesirable present course offerings, as the necessary price, given a relatively fixed institutional income, of undertaking new and more promising curricular experiments. Some such displacement has in fact occurred voluntarily on the part of cooperating departments. But present sanctions are weak, and the issue of redeployment of fixed resources is obviously an institutional, as well as a departmental, concern. The university needs to develop a more coherent scheme for arriving at its academic priorities. In that process, the new division can only be one among partners, but it can make its distinctive contribution.

A few summary figures convey something of the scope and scale of divisional activities to date. A total of 123 faculty members are or have been involved in major committee assignments and in the teaching of experimental courses. The total includes 72 faculty members from 21 departments in our college of arts and sciences; 11 from law; 16 from education; 7 from medicine; 5 from engineering; 9 from government and business administration; and 3 from public and international affairs. Of that larger total, 83 faculty members have been or are involved in the teaching of our courses. Seventeen courses initiated by the division (under its several names) have been or will soon be absorbed by other academic units, in sponsorship and in budget support. The division has participated in the recruitment of eleven new faculty members now holding appointments in traditional academic disciplines. The division has been directly involved in the development of two new B.A. programs; of a new clinical law program; of two new master's degree programs; and a new program in our college of arts and sciences in general and interdisciplinary studies. Virtually all the costs of the above programs have now been absorbed by other units of the university. A new Ph.D. program has been inaugurated. Finally, over the grant period a total of $1,283,358 has been secured from other outside sources.

BUDGETING FOR ACADEMIC CHANGE

Henry Solomon*

It is no secret that the budget is a potent tool in academic administration. How it is used and the means for its derivation varies by institution and often by academic units within an institution. In this very brief statement, there is no intent to offer a comprehensive or

* Dean, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and Professor of Economics.

critical review of budgeting procedures. The much more modest objective is to offer a few issues which seem to be general and to describe one of many possible ways to effect change. For purposes of this statement, we will not be concerned with changes in the size of the budget, but rather will assume a fixed total budget and direct our attention to budget allocations. The assumption of a fixed total is fairly realistic these days.

A few major technical and institutional issues or problems are as follows:

Budget allocation procedures typically tend to emphasize inputs when, at the same time, our major concerns are educational objectives and outputs.

Budget periods are usually limited to a future one-year time horizon. This inhibits planning and effective change, and the evaluation of the consequences of change. Examples of the difficulties are (i) the investment of human and/or physical capital to accomplish the change must be made for a period beyond the budget time horizon; (ii) evaluation of a change after a one-year period is often premature if not impossible; and, (iii) budgeting from year to year is not conducive to planning for change.

Among the most difficult problems is the task of meaningful and operational specifications of academic priorities. While difficult, it is obviously essential in order to determine what changes in curriculum are required and desirable.

Assuming that academic priorities can be specified and that reasonable estimates can be made of the education production function (i.e., the combination of inputs to achieve desired outputs), some innovative budgeting techniques may be employed. One example which has been used for the introduction of new courses and programs at George Washington University is to create an "internal foundation" within the University (a function now served by the Division of Experimental Programs). This unit provides incentives for departments to experiment with new offerings over a multi-year period; and it includes apparatus for later evaluation by the department and the "foundation," resulting in a decision to terminate the new course or to place it in the curriculum funded from normal budgetary sources. If the latter pertains, again assuming no increase in the total budget, the new course will be offered in place of a previously offered course.

The apparatus may be established with an essentially negligible investment in total dollars or as a percent of the budget. The small amount of money needed as start-up costs for new curricular experiments is placed in a revolving fund. The funds are used mainly to buy faculty time for the new courses (which requires academic justification relative to priorities). A small amount is allocated to cooperating departments as discretionary money, placed in an education and research fund. This provides incentive funds for the departments. Tuition revenues generated by the new courses are attributed in whole or in part to the "fund" which enhances the "foundation's" capability for buying additional faculty time in accordance with priorities. Once the department adopts

the new course in its regular curriculum, it is embodied in the normal budget process. The "foundation" provides the capability for attaining academic objectives and priorities through experimentation and curriculum development over reasonable time horizons. Also it assures academic and fiscal evaluation without major and premature dislocations.

THE RISE AND "FALL" OF A SOPHOMORE HONORS PROGRAM AND THE EMERGENCE OF THE 700 SERIES

Harry Yeide, Jr.*

In the late 60's, there was considerable administrative and faculty desire to develop some sort of "honors work" courses designed to recruit unusually strong students and to promote their intellectual development in non-routine ways. There was clearly little agreement on how to implement this desire; several proposals were presented to the faculty and voted down, chiefly, I suspect, because only a few departments were scheduled for involvement in the program. A new committee finally presented a proposal that was accepted and set into operation in the fall of 1969. Salient features included: 1) an "interdisciplinary" flavor; 2) classes modeled after the graduate seminar, i.e., small group, discussion, semester projects, etc.; 3) involvement of freshmen and sophomores during what was then construed to be the "general education" phase in their degree work; 4) potential involvement of faculty from all departments with no administrative links to any departments; 5) administration by an Assistant Dean with the support of an Advisory Committee appointed by the Dean; 6) a general understanding that the departments providing faculty to the program would receive the funds necessary to hire a part-time lecturer to replace the participating faculty member in one of his or her regular classes; 7) informal funding initially provided by a small grant from the Exxon Foundation and no settled agreement as to what would be done in the longer-range future. Item 6 was "violated" from the beginning. Some faculty participants felt that adequate replacements could not be found and conducted their honors seminars as overload. Others lacked pressing teaching assignments in any case so that their departments did not really need funding for a replacement. This common-sense practice helped create a preference in later years when our "informal financing" was no longer linked to any particular grant; one necessarily preferred faculty who would bring no easily identified cost to the program.

Other problems also emerged over time. It became clear that many departments actively discouraged their faculty from participating. Other departments were less direct, but appear to have been unimpressed or negatively impressed by duty in honors seminars when making tenure judgments. We found ourselves drawing faculty from a relatively small number of departments. While the spread among natural sciences, social sciences and humanities was tolerable, we were disproportionately thin

* Assistant Dean of Columbian College of Arts and Sciences and Professor of Religion.

in the first-named category. Changes in departmental chairmanship often had an impact on the availability of faculty. Without a truly assured budget, we had little to offer to departments by way of incentive. Some departments were, however, exceptionally supportive.

Some changes were made in response to expressions of student desires and their enrollment patterns. (There was a very active, self-generated honors student organization in the early years.) Most conspicuously, we added an independent study option, and telescoped the program into the sophomore year. The logic for placing the program in the sophomore year soon became dubious, however, when a major curricular reform all but abolished the notion of a degree program divided between two years of "general education" and two years of "special education." The demise of this rationale, which had seemed important in the initial decision to have this kind of honors program, did not seem of major interest to the faculty; some students reacted by arguing that the experience should not be confined to the sophomore year.

The year 1969 also marked the infusion of NEH funds into the University to, among other things, foster "the development and sponsorship of new courses and programs." Newness in many instances meant "interdisciplinary" or one of the near relatives (extradisciplinary, multidisciplinary, etc.). Under the NEH grant, many new courses were developed that fed many of the intellectual interests identified by the honors program. These courses were not specifically directed to the special clientele served by the honors program, but of course many potential honors students pursued their interdisciplinary interests in these courses. The courses sponsored under the grant also related to formal budgets that offered incentives to departments well beyond any ever envisaged in planning the honors program. Not surprisingly, there was some movement of faculty out of the honors program and into some of the newer, more soundly financed interdisciplinary projects. I do not mean to imply avarice on the part of these persons; they had sound academic and academically political reasons for such a move. Others remained more interested in the honors program, primarily because of the access it offered to small groups of gifted students. There were also different notions about course development in the two programs.

In 1975, interested parties began to consider whether the honors program and one segment of programs sponsored with NEH funds should be merged into a unified program with a unified administrative structure. Long negotiations produced such a proposal, adopted by the faculty October 8, 1975. We now have a "Columbian College Program for New Courses in General and Interdisciplinary Studies," more affectionately referred to as the "700 Series" in honor of the new catalogue numbers that were developed to designate the new courses. In an effort to increase the departments' sense of ownership of these new courses, arrangements were made to list the courses under the departments of the instructors participating in the courses. This can result in multiple listing of a single course. It is not clear yet that this arrangement has had the desired psychological impact. We have also failed, so far, to escape problems of informal financing, despite strenuous efforts to secure a regularized place in the College budget. While there is now sufficient funding to support what we are doing, the future remains cloudy.

The courses offered in the 700 Series are currently of two sorts. The 701 GS number is used to designate courses taught by a single instructor, whose task it is to explore a topic not encompassed in the normal offerings of his department, and to utilize insights and methods of disciplines in addition to his or her own. The honors seminars are the precedents for this model, now freed of the earlier requirements of sophomore status, high grades, and limited enrollment. The 721 IS number designated courses in which faculty from two or more departments delve into a theme, topic or issue of shared academic interest. Previous courses sponsored under the NEH grant are precedents for this model.

The new arrangements have solved some of our past problems with respect to the development of academic experience with an interdisciplinary flavor. But many remain. Faculty who are most interested often reside in departments that are least interested. Faculty members often propose courses for reasons that have little relation to the goals of the program, e.g., underemployment in their own departments. Many colleagues continue to doubt that interdisciplinary work is ever truly "sound" academically. Every change in administrative structure causes confusion that is often difficult to clarify to persons with only a casual interest in the effort. But we hope to address these and other issues, and to make the 700 Series a more significant component and a more useful tool in our total academic effort.

THE SOCIOLOGY DEPARTMENT AND THE DIVISION OF EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS

Ruth Wallace*

As I view it, there are four areas where the effects of the Division of Experimental Programs on the sociology department are evident. Let me discuss them in the following paragraphs.

First, the sociology department, after a period of experimenting, adapted the service-learning approach and introduced as a permanent course Sociology 151-152, Problems of Urban Social Systems--Supervised Field Work. This course, which was introduced by Dr. Joseph Tropea, has also been taught by Dr. Phyllis Stewart, and, in Fall 1977 it will be taught by Dr. Thomas Courtless. It is a 15 credit course, combining lectures and readings on selected social problems and field work in a specific agency. Thus far, juvenile justice systems and health care systems have been chosen as topics. In the fall semester I understand that the topic will be criminal justice systems.

Another course, Sociology 153, Poverty in America, has been adopted as an interdepartmental course with the economics department. Dr. Boeckmann and Dr. Yezer prepared and taught this course, and it has been very successful. Dr. Boeckmann has also developed a course on Inequality which has been offered once under the Honors Program and once under the Program in General and Interdisciplinary Studies. This is tentatively scheduled as a graduate seminar for the Fall 1977 semester.

* Associate Professor of Sociology.

With the support of DEP funds, Dr. Patricia Lengermann prepared a proposal for a specialization in Sociology and Social Policy on the Master's level. This proposal was adopted by the sociology department and we admitted new students into this program in Fall 1977.

One course, entitled "Urban Problems and Policies," Sociology 128, was supported from time to time by DEP funds and is now a permanent spring semester offering. The current instructor is Dr. John Helmer. A former member of the department, Dr. William Martineau, also taught a course on the Sociology of the Spanish-Speaking Communities for the Division.

In 1971-72 and 1972-73, Dr. Ruth Wallace team-taught Experimental Programs 51-52 with two faculty members from Humanities and one from social science. The interdisciplinary experience in that course led to her current participation as a member of the Committee on the interdisciplinary Masters of Arts Program in Special Studies/Individual Programs.

In summary, seven present members of the sociology department have been affected, to a greater or lesser degree, by DEP. Given that the department is composed of ten full-time members, the impact is not an inconsiderable one.

INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS AT GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY: THE EXPERIENCE WITH LEGAL STUDIES

Ralph C. Nash, Jr.*

Approximately five years ago we began talking about the desirability of introducing courses on the legal process into the undergraduate curriculum. After a long period of planning and consulting, Exp. Hum. 171-172, The Legal Process, was initiated in Spring 1975 and the course has been given each semester thereafter. This statement contains my impressions on the feasibility of such efforts--derived from the experience gained in promoting this course.

Initially, the success of the course should be appraised. It has drawn an average of 15-20 students each semester and the student evaluations have indicated that most students thought the course worthwhile. A proposal to expand the effort into an undergraduate major was made to the faculty of the School of Public and International Affairs last year and that faculty decided to defer decision on the proposal until further information and support could be generated. In the face of these rather uninspiring endorsements (by the students and faculty), it has been decided to drop the course after this semester. Parenthetically, this has occurred at George Washington at a time when undergraduate programs in the law are springing up at numerous colleges and universities around the country.

* Professor of Law, National Law Center.

The problems encountered here were several:

1. The student response to the course was never strong. Although I am not very qualified to evaluate the meaning of this low response, my guess is that it was largely attributable to the fact that the course had no departmental home. As an Experimental Humanities course, it was clearly labeled as an unattached offering. It had no advisors to promote it and it fit into no departmental program. In addition, it got the reputation of requiring a substantial amount of work of an independent nature. Further, since one of the teachers was a law professor and the other an instructor, the course had the appearance of being outside of the regular flow of undergraduate courses.

2. There was no ready means of giving the course a departmental home or of creating an undergraduate major in law. With several schools giving undergraduate degrees, there were at least two choices for schools to approach to establish a major--Columbian College or SPIA. It was decided that SPIA, as the smaller school and one which seemed to have a special concern for interdisciplinary work, was the logical school to sponsor such a new effort. However, the SPIA faculty was exceedingly cautious in dealing with the proposal. There were great concerns about the financial requirements of a new program and additional concerns as to the implications in terms of adding members of other disciplines to the SPIA faculty. The thought that a new major could be tested experimentally without major institutional commitments was received with great skepticism. The attitude of the faculty in this case was one of extreme caution. In retrospect, it is clear that my personal attitude of willingness to participate in the program but not to vigorously promote it led to some of this caution.

3. The sponsorship of the course by the Division of Experimental Programs isolated it from the regular administrative channels of the University. The course was never cleared through a department by a dean. The dean of the law school was gracious in allowing me to teach the course but had no further contact with it. The deans of the undergraduate schools had no knowledge of the course. If the course had been promoted originally as the beginning of an interdisciplinary effort between the law school and the undergraduate programs (which was our intention), it would have encountered innumerable obstacles from both faculties and administration to obtain approval. We circumvented this approval chain by creating the course outside of the normal administrative framework of the University; but we undoubtedly sowed the seeds of our subsequent problems by originating the course in this manner. It was our hope that overwhelming student response would carry the day but alas!

My conclusion is relatively simple. DEP, operating outside of the normal administrative channels, can have a minor impact on the curriculum of the University but will never promote changes of great consequence. The best that can be hoped for is the origination of a few new courses--preferably in existing departments. If interdisciplinary programs are wanted, they will have to be endorsed and financed from the beginning by existing schools. I realize that this is another way of stating that interdisciplinary programs are not likely to be created at this University where all of the incentives work counter to cooperative

efforts between schools. However, our experience with the Legal Process course leads me to believe that it is exceedingly difficult to subvert the existing system.

PHILOSOPHERS AND SOCIAL POLICY: THE M. A. PROGRAM IN PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIAL POLICY

T. Z. Lavine*

Development of Program

In the fall semester of 1974 the Department of Philosophy at George Washington University ventured upon a new path in its graduate offerings: the development of a curriculum for an M. A. in Philosophy and Social Policy. The motivation for this attempt at curriculum change came in part from the shrinkage of job opportunities for graduate students in traditional graduate programs in philosophy and from the declining number of graduate degree candidates. Another motivating factor was the appealing intrinsic significance of attempting a program in which philosophy would be brought to bear upon the range of problems involved in public policy. The perception of the magnitude and human import of policy problems as well as the perception of a role for philosophy in opening up, unpacking and offering analytical and substantive contributions to policy issues underlay this second motivating factor.

The development of this non-traditional and "challenging" (i.e., demanding, tough, anxiety-producing) project was the product of the following necessary conditions: (1) the aid of the Division of Experimental Programs, in the forms of arranging planning sessions, funding, and the providing of a large encompassing vision of the role of the humanities in the university and in the life of the city; (2) the motivation on the part of the Philosophy Department to find a new direction for its graduate program in the face of the changing academic outlook for the humanities in the 1970's; (3) a growing focus on policy studies within the graduate programs of George Washington University (and outside of the University as well), with which the new program could be seen to mesh; (4) the availability within the Philosophy Department of a nucleus of professional philosophers with interests linking them to other disciplines, and with a conception of philosophy as consisting in historical, analytical, normative and integrative skills which can be usefully applied to problem-solving in everyday life, in the natural and social sciences, in the other humanities, and thus also in the complexities of problem-solving in large scale public policy.

Administrative Strategy

The introduction into the graduate curriculum of a new program, in which the Philosophy Department utilized some of its resources to link philosophy with the complex policy area, was accomplished administratively by employing as an umbrella an existing interdisciplinary

* Chairman, Department of Philosophy and Elton Professor of Philosophy.

structure, the M. A. in Special Studies, which has a course requirement of a meaningful distribution over three disciplines. Administrative approval was thus facilitated, with the new program presenting itself as a variant of a type of existing program and with the Philosophy Department as its administrative agency.

The Division of Experimental Programs provided a decisive contribution to the administration of the new program through funding the half-time services of a director for the program, recruited from the field of American Civilization and from the administrative staff of the division. In addition to administrative responsibility for the program, a task which the existing manpower of the department could not cover, the director teaches one of the four required courses of the program, thus supplementing the courses taught by the three cooperating full-time members of the department.

Design

The program consists of a core of four required courses (offered by the Philosophy Department) and of courses selected from two disciplines outside the department, with or without a thesis. The four courses offered by the Philosophy Department are: Philosophy 195, Man and Nature in Public Policy (3): Influence of philosophical conceptions of man and nature on national policies of growth and development in selected periods of American history; Philosophy 198, Philosophy of the Social Sciences (3): Analysis of philosophical issues relating to theory, methodology and application of the social sciences, with exemplification in one major contemporary social scientific project; Philosophy 231, Ethics and Economic Policy: Justice and Equality (3): Economic policy viewed from the perspectives of ethical and economic theories with special focus upon the issue of income distribution in the United States; and Philosophy 272, Pragmatic Naturalism and American Social Policy (3): Examination of pragmatic naturalism as a criticism and reconstruction of American institutions, and evaluation of current philosophical and theological alternatives to naturalism and proposal of a new "ecologistic" naturalism. Additional core courses will be a function of program growth and of the focus of student and faculty interest.

Does It Work?

The growth of the program has been slow but encouraging in the face of little money available for publicity and none for fellowships. To judge from its present clientele, the program appears to have a variety of utilities: for pre-law students and for law school graduates; as a Master's program foundational to Ph.D. programs; and as policy orientation for some who are holding and for some who are seeking policy-related positions in federal, state, or local organizations. The student body appears, at regular meetings with the faculty, to be well satisfied with the ability of the program to serve their needs; and with the uniqueness of the program in respect to the scope and level of analysis of the problems addressed. The faculty is satisfied with the vitality of the program and with the progress to date.

Transferability

In principle the contributing factors (or factors sufficiently similar) which resulted in the M. A. in Philosophy and Social Policy at George Washington University are replicable at other universities in the U. S. Programs of a similar type have recently begun to appear at other universities.

THE INTERDISCIPLINARY PH.D. PROGRAM IN EDUCATION POLICY

Carl J. Lange*

An interdisciplinary Ph.D. Program in Education Policy, offered by the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, began in Fall 1975. Planned under the auspices of the Division of Experimental Programs (DEP), it resulted from the confluence of the interests of several schools at the University, several sponsored activities, and professionals in the local community. The location of the University was paramount in supporting the notion of a degree program related to a major policy area.

What are the essential features of the strategy pursued in the planning and early years of operating such a program? In retrospect, the key stages included the initial decision to explore the concept, search for a definition of the program and its structure, and implementation.

The decision to explore the concept and feasibility of a new program was reached in a meeting (Summer 1972) convened by President Elliott. Participants included the Director of DEP, several deans, faculty members, and staff members of the Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL), a sponsored program.

The Director of DEP was given the responsibility of exploring the concept with a group of interested faculty and staff. This first meeting was significant because representatives of key activities who would need to support the program sanctioned the general concept.

The Director began meeting with a group of interested faculty and individuals actively involved in education policy to define and structure a program. Membership of the group varied as planning progressed, but representation consistently included the major social science departments in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, the School of Education, and several spokesmen for those involved in policy-making in the Washington area. Through a series of meetings, a graduate program in education policy was developed. It took about six months of intermittent meetings.

* Vice President for Administration and Research and Associate Professor of Psychology.

This stage of development of the program was significant because it involved key representation of both faculty and the policy community in resolving issues. Major issues included the level of the degree (M.A. or Ph.D.), scope of the program (public school vs. higher education), credit for experiential learning, the dissertation requirement, and the structure of the program of studies. Through an iteration of questions posed by the DEP Director and answers by members of the planning group relating to these issues, a concept of a degree program was developed and a petition was presented to the Graduate School. By then, interested parties had evolved a concept that reflected resolution of major issues.

How were these issues resolved? It was decided early that the program would be a research degree at the Ph.D. level and would be applicable to the full range of education, i.e., elementary and secondary as well as higher education. It would be interdisciplinary, and a policy field would be required including a six-hour core seminar in education policy. Three related issues were sources of tension between the faculty views and the views of some in the policy community. These were the dissertation requirement, the matter of credit for experiential learning, and the requirement of depth in a discipline. The program as finally evolved would require a policy-related dissertation and depth in a discipline as well as a required field of education policy. It would not allow credit for experiential learning or depart from the traditional requirement for a dissertation. The Education Policy field would allow credit for work done in a job setting under a plan approved by an appropriate faculty member. The persuasive arguments of Stephen Bailey at critical points helped to resolve these issues because he spoke from extensive experience in both the academic and policy-making worlds.

Following approval of the program by the Graduate School, a Ph.D. committee was appointed by the Dean. The program structured by this committee was planned for students entering at or near the Master's degree level. Requirements were set at a minimum of twelve hours in a discipline of concentration, twelve hours in Education Policy, and two additional supporting fields. Within these broad requirements, the student was left with considerable flexibility in shaping a particular curriculum.

In the implementation, adjunct professors from the policy community serve on the committee and teach policy seminars. Students have the opportunity of studying with individuals currently involved in education policy issues and research related to these issues.

The program developed slowly. It took from 1972 to 1977--five years--to get from initial discussions of the vague concept to a program in its second year with ten to twelve students. But the initial thinking was to start small. It was viewed as a pilot program. It was to be built primarily on existing strengths and capabilities.

As the program matures, a research program will be developed to supplement the teaching program and provide research opportunities for some of the students. Also, closer working relationships with other activities at the University (such as IEL) and those outside the University should develop.

A general observation concerning strategy is that ideas for cooperative efforts in a program of this sort must await the opportune time. Good ideas may be dormant for two, three, or more years before successful implementation is possible.

From the beginning, the program brought together representatives of the world of action, those working in the policy community, and the world of the disciplines, the faculty. Early tensions resulted from occasional exaggerated views from one or the other of these different worlds. But the objective is to prepare individuals to identify policy issues, translate them into research problems and interpret the findings of research as they apply to the issues. The combination of problem-oriented seminars in education policy, the concentration in a discipline, and the policy-related dissertation will allow students to develop their particular strengths, interests, and abilities toward this end. Accommodation of the exaggerated views of either group would have thwarted this objective.

THE ROLE OF FACULTY-STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

Roderick S. French*

An important strategy in the development of faculty and student support for initiatives from the Division of Experimental Programs (under its several names) was the formation of faculty-student discussion groups. These groups, along with a myriad of committees and planning groups, became our surrogates for departmental faculties and student majors.

In September 1970 a memorandum was addressed to eight faculty members who were thought to be interested in "occasional, informal, not-too-long sessions in which men and women from various departments could debate provocative suggestions for teaching reform in our post-modern times." Those who responded to that rhetoric were invited to become the self-appointed charter members of the Free and Easy Society, and to bring one student guest to the first meeting. (Ben Franklin had proposed the formation of a Free and Easy Society when a rising young man in Philadelphia. It was to be composed of debt-free persons dedicated to the reform of themselves and society. He became so busy with his achievements that the group never met. The several ironies seemed to make the name appropriate for a group of reform-minded academic humanists in the counter-culture era.)

The Free and Easy Society met more or less regularly each month for the next three years. Both faculty and students were encouraged to use the Society as a place for critical, sympathetic discussion of ideas for new courses or thoughts about new ways of teaching and learning. The Society also played a part in the discussions of the ultimately

*Coordinator, Humanities Development Program, Division of Experimental Programs and Associate Professor of Philosophy.

successful proposal to NEH for an institutional development grant. When the NEH site visitors came to the campus one of their most persuasive encounters was with this group of faculty and students clearly committed to the basic objectives of the proposal.

As the magnitude of our efforts increased--supported now by two large grants--it seemed appropriate to provide a forum for discussion of issues related to educational philosophy and policy. The majority of the new courses involved more than one discipline. Therefore, the Dilthey Society was organized in the fall of 1972 specifically to promote discussion of problems related to interdisciplinary research and teaching.

Both the Free and Easy Society and the Dilthey Society combined presentations by guests who described innovative programs or courses developed at other institutions and contributions by members of our own university community.

A special word should be said about the usefulness of "distinguished visitors." We several times invited such people to spend a number of days on our campus in a series of conversations with faculty, students and administrators. They were always chosen because of the appropriateness of their professional experience to urgent interests of members of our university.

This mixed strategy of informal faculty-student associations serving as both the hosts for distinguished educators from other institutions and as continuing forums for discussion of local theory and practice made two contributions to the progress of curriculum development: (1) It helped to develop a vocal and high-spirited constituency for what otherwise might have remained a rather lonely initiative. (2) It served as a continuing stimulus to the imagination of our university community which gave rise to a steady flow of new ideas for courses and programs.

EVALUATING EXPERIMENTAL COURSES: THE GW EXPERIENCE

Marshall W. Davies*

The Division of Experimental Programs, since its earliest days as the GW Washington Project, has taken an intense interest in the evaluation of the classes it has supported. That interest has been displayed not only through the division's rhetoric, but also through the allocation of scarce funds for evaluation activities. Those funds supported an evaluation effort that evolved through several stages over eight years.

*Coordinator of Curriculum Research, Division of Experimental Programs.

The division has always been committed to "informal" evaluation, i.e., written or verbal reactions of students and teachers to the courses in which they participated. But, in addition, there has also always been an effort at "formal" evaluation, i.e., evaluation by some neutral person responsible for systematic course evaluation. The first such evaluator was a GW faculty member who conducted an evaluation of one of the division's first experimental classes.

The following year a major evaluation program was launched. An office of evaluation was established in the D. C. Consortium of Universities, and several elaborate statistical studies were conducted. The results were disappointing. Few significant results were found, and many faculty members lacked confidence in the evaluation techniques that were used. At the recommendation of a faculty committee, the consortium office was closed.

A method of evaluation based on interviews of students was then developed.[1] The technique yielded data on the structure of courses which proved to be useful to those designing and teaching those courses. The new technique was much more acceptable to the faculty. Several graduate students were commissioned to conduct such evaluations, but the evaluation program lacked sustained leadership.

Subsequently, a new coordinator of evaluation was appointed, and the current program of evaluation was begun. The new coordinator started by establishing close working relationships with the faculty members whose courses would be evaluated. It was made clear that the intent of any evaluation would be course improvement. Drawing on past experience, evaluation designs often made use of both questionnaires and interviews. The primary consideration in any evaluation design was faculty acceptance.

Overall, this program of evaluation has been satisfactory, but there have been some disappointments. In the early days there were hopes for a "ripple effect" by which the division's interest in evaluation would spread to other parts of the university. Perhaps we hoped for too much, but, for whatever reason, interest did not spread. Neither GW's faculty nor its administration showed any real interest in our attempts at course evaluation. More recently, time was spent developing a questionnaire which was designed to reveal certain characteristics of students enrolled in classes sponsored by the division. The idea was that we could serve our students better if we knew more about their attitudes and interests. For the questionnaire to be really useful, however, it would also have had to have been administered to students who were not taking our classes. We needed a comparison group, and we were interested in broadening our appeal to other students. Again we hoped that interest in our questionnaire would spread; again we were disappointed. The data we collected on our own students proved to be interesting but only marginally useful. The questionnaire was discontinued after three semesters.

---

[1]This method was based on Flanagan's critical incident technique; see John C. Flanagan, "The Critical Incident Technique," Psychological Bulletin, LI (July, 1954), pp. 327-355.

Generally, however, the current evaluation program has been successful. Faculty members in our courses have come to expect evaluation, and they have cooperated fully. Most important, several courses have been altered significantly as a result of evaluations. We have learned a great deal about what kind of evaluation program works for us. Perhaps the most useful summary of that experience would be in terms of major shifts in emphasis that we have made. Three such shifts are outlined below.

1) We have moved from basing our evaluation program on a single, pre-determined methodology, to basing it on a pluralistic approach, open to various methodologies. This shift was based on our concern that no evaluation was useful for course improvement if the faculty member designing and teaching the course did not fully accept the results. We have made every effort, therefore, to design evaluations using methodologies that are acceptable to the faculty member. We have attempted to keep the faculty member continually involved in the evaluation process, which has called for more than consultation on goals and objectives. The faculty member has become an important part of the evaluation process rather than simply a person whose course is being evaluated. Such an open approach has often restricted what we were able to measure, but a few general results which were taken seriously have had much more impact than a wide array of technically perfect results which were looked upon with suspicion.

2) We have moved from a total reliance on "hard" research based on highly objective statistical techniques, to a primary reliance on "soft" research based on more subjective techniques. One reason for that shift was that many of our humanistically oriented faculty were reluctant to accept results based on procedures that they did not fully trust or understand. A second reason was that we felt that the "hard" methodology was being applied beyond its reasonable limits. We were not confident that the behaviors we could measure really reflected the broad goals from which they were derived. The "softer" methods did not permit us to measure many of the subtle shifts in attitudes and opinions that the "harder" methods--in theory--could. But we did have more confidence in the results we were able to obtain.

3) We have moved from evaluation intended to make a final judgement as to the success of a course, to evaluation intended to facilitate improvement of a course (i.e., from "summative" to "formative" evaluation). Actually, our intention in evaluation had always been to promote course improvement. However, our early attempts at objectivity and hard research yielded results that were most useful in summative decisions. As we moved away from that methodology, evaluation became formative in fact as well as in intent. An important part of the shift from summative to formative evaluation was a shift from reporting to others (a consortium-based office, NEH), to reporting to ourselves.

Actually, our program of evaluation has been more complex than this discussion of "formal" evaluation suggests. A committee structure has screened proposed courses in advance and required that they be responsive to the division's goals and priorities. Every course has not been formally evaluated every semester, but most courses have been formally evaluated at least once, and some have been evaluated semester after

semester. Occasionally an outside consultant was brought in to look at a special problem. Finally, "informal" evaluation by faculty and students has been encouraged and taken seriously. All of this has added up to a comprehensive and, we feel, an effective evaluation program.

III. SUMMARY OF SMALL-GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Workshop participants were, generally, administrators who had been trained in the humanities. There was agreement among them that a number of changes should be made in humanities curriculums and in general education. While both means and ends, as relates to change, were discussed, the focus was upon means.

A. Why Change? The most immediate problem for the humanities, discussants agreed, was that of dropping enrollments and the threat or fact of dropping budgets. Almost all disciplines within the humanities find themselves with fewer enrollments and majors. The dropping of degree requirements has decimated lower-level course enrollments. The new pressure to quantify "productivity" of departments is not systematically balanced by pressure to improve the quality and balance of undergraduate education.

Morale among humanists was described as low. They were called "retrospective," "introspective" and "puristic." They were said to be uninvolved in discussions having to do with curricular and institutional directions. They were described as in retreat relative to colleagues in other academic divisions. They were represented as uninvolved in debate as to public policy. It was argued that the enrollment scare did have the positive effect of making humanists sensible of their plight.

There was concern about the state of general education. The dropping of degree requirements in the recent past has contributed to an increased miscellaneousness in the education of our students. The humanists are as much the prisoners of departmentalization as are their colleagues in other divisions. Humanists think of themselves as custodians of value and generalists. They have not, however, developed any remarkable capacity for rigorous value analysis of a kind that "opens out" to the sciences and professions and to issues of public policy. Liberal education is usually represented as a nurturer of freedom of inquiry. Humanists, however, have not been conspicuous as critics of conventional wisdoms.

There was said to be confusion as to the standards to be applied to present-day education on the part of humanists. How are they to respond with integrity to the many kinds of "new" students? To the increasing emphasis upon vocational preparation? To the shrinking globe?

There was some sense of distance between the discussants, as administrators, and the group they were describing as academic humanists. There was also an identification on their part, as academic humanists, with the need to improve upon the present disarray and depression in the humanities.

B. Change How? The discussants expressed some impatience with themselves, in that they seemed to turn all too readily from general questions of goals to specific questions of tactics. They supposed that they had become habituated by their experience as administrators to "thinking small."

They represented the role of the administrator as that of goad and catalyst, one who was much more able to block initiatives on the part of others than to initiate much on his own. They agreed on the present need, described at the conclusion of the McArthur paper, to justify what is presently in place to the higher administration of the college or system. Because there was little prospect of increased budgets, or of significant faculty turnover, changes would have to be achieved through better use of existing resources. The prospect of grant money could be deceptive, if the grant involved increased fixed commitments and/or committed the institution to programs it would not otherwise support. Discussants agreed that there was a need to cut out deadwood among faculty and administrators, but had few thoughts as to how that might be done. There was an unenthusiastic consensus as to the need for "faculty development" programs. Most of the discussion had to do with review of means for creating counterbalances to the power of individual academic departments to the end of achieving more collegiality among humanists and throughout the arts and sciences.

They liked the idea of beginning with informal caucuses of the kind that Mr. Lindell instituted at Denver. In that case, the dean selected a small group of able and influential faculty members to meet with him on a regular basis for informal discussion of common problems. Such small beginnings can, possibly, lead to discussion among the entire faculty, as was occurring at several of the schools represented at the workshop. Ordinarily this in turn led to particular agenda items and the establishment of committees to review and report back on those items. Limited funds might be made available, as an incentive and as a visible token of interest on the part of the administration, to bring in outside visitors and to give a few faculty members released time or overtime pay for their involvement. A problem with committees is that they are temporary creations. They tend to have little sense of what is being done on related issues elsewhere in the country or, at an earlier time, at their own institutions. Several individuals argued that what was needed was a radical overhaul in the content of the humanities and in the conceptual community existing among humanists. Most of the discussants showed little interest in such radical change, in part because they felt that talk of such change was often empty and in part because they felt that such change was politically infeasible.

Most of the discussants urged that institutions begin with means at hand and give their attention to useful incremental changes. Most academic departments offer "topics" courses in which the subject-matter changes from year to year. Such courses could be the vehicle for testing out new course ideas. The teacher of a topics course in one department could cooperate with the teacher of a topics course in another department and thus initiate interdisciplinary cooperation within the existing curriculum. Interested faculty members can cooperate in "cluster" courses, whereby through coordinated planning and scheduling courses from several departments can become mutually complementary, again with no very great change in existing curriculum. Programs in environmental studies or urban affairs or other interdisciplinary areas can be initiated with minimal changes in the listing of courses. They represent a further refinement of the "cluster" idea, and can easily lead to new academic major or minor options. The Master of Arts in Special Studies, as offered at GW, carries the same idea to the graduate level. The

M.A.S.S. program allows for small and even individualized graduate programs each involving at least three academic departments. All such changes are designed to operate within the interstices of the conventionally departmentalized college or university. Such changes, given the visible support of the dean and the departments, can serve as at least temporary stimulants to faculty discussion and development. Such short-term stimulation has a definite value, and is even preferable on certain counts to commitments to long-term change. On the other hand, if time and circumstances are right, a family of incremental changes can have a long-term cumulative effect upon the quality of education throughout a college or university.

Discussants commented that the GW model was in some respects inappropriate for their particular institutions. For one thing, it depended upon outside funding to get under way. For another, many of the specific programs initiated by the Division of Experimental Programs are plausible because the university is in the nation's capital. Finally, the urgencies of the urban crisis and of student unrest are no longer seen to be urgent, and so the stimulus for major change must now be located elsewhere. Few of the represented institutions had a special academic division for interdisciplinary studies. There was general interest in the devices GW has worked out for rewarding interdisciplinary participation on the part of faculty and departments.

The GW model for formal evaluation of courses received little attention from the discussants. They seemed to assume that collegial review was the only valid means of course evaluation.

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

Attending From Other Institutions

Harvey Buchanan, Provost, Humanities and Arts, Case Western Reserve University
Hubert J. Cloke, Assistant Dean, Georgetown University
Susan Cole, Program Officer, Institutional Development Grants, National Endowment for the Humanities
Mary Ann Cook, SND, Academic Dean, Trinity College
Mary Louise Gehring, Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Baylor University
Jay L. Halio, Associate Provost for Instruction and Professor of English, University of Delaware
Sr. Mary Oliver Hudon, Director of Weekend College Program and Assistant Professor of Education, College of Notre Dame of Maryland
Dilys M. Jones, Dean of Academic Administration, Shippensburg State College
Bette E. Landman, Dean of the College, Beaver College
Janice Litwin, Consultants Program, Division of Education Programs, National Endowment for the Humanities
Martha B. Montgomery, Chairman, Department of Humanities - Communications, Drexel University
Louis Norris, Washington, D. C.
Carol A. Preece, Assistant Professor, Department of History, Federal City College
Wilhelm Reuning, Academic Dean and Professor of History, Susquehanna University
John B. Smith, Associate Professor of English, Pennsylvania State University
Thomas V. Thoroughman, Associate Professor of History and Project Director for Humanities Program, Wofford College
Robert E. Wagoner, Dean, Division of Arts and Humanities, Juniata College
Judith R. Weiner, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Mount Vernon College

Attending From George Washington University

Rita Abraham, former GW student
Harold F. Bright, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; Professor of Statistics
Marshall W. Davies, Coordinator, Service Learning Program, Division of Experimental Programs
Roderick S. French, Coordinator, Humanities Development Program, Division of Experimental Programs
Lois Goldberg, Recent GW graduate; Former Service-Learning student
Margot Kernan, Coordinator, Film Studies Curriculum, Division of Experimental Programs
Carl J. Lange, Vice President for Administration and Research; Associate Professor of Psychology
Thelma Z. Lavine, Elton Professor of Philosophy
Clarence C. Mondale, Director, Division of Experimental Programs
Ralph C. Nash, Jr., Professor of Law

Henry Solomon, Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences; Professor of Economics
Ruth A. Wallace, Associate Professor of Sociology
Gregory H. Williams, Assistant Director, Division of Experimental Programs
Harry E. Yeide, Jr., Assistant Dean of Columbian College; Professor of Religion

Outside Experts

Edward J. Kormondy, Provost, The Evergreen State College
Edward Lindell, President, Gustavus Adolphus College
Herbert McArthur, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs, State University of New York